

## **Rebuttal to the Argument in Support of Proposition 84**

### **PROPOSITION 84 CANNOT DELIVER ON ITS PROMISES**

It will not benefit everyone, but everyone will pay for it through higher taxes or budget cuts for education, law enforcement, and health services.

### **NO on 84 PROTECTS THE PUBLIC TREASURY**

Prop. 84 gives state bureaucrats the power to spend your money without effective oversight. This proposal eliminates protections against corruption and favoritism in current law and it bypasses our competitive bidding system. It prevents audits by the State Controller, the State Auditor, and even the Legislative Analyst. It exempts itself from the Administrative Procedures Act. Ask yourself why the proponents fear routine audits.

### **NO on 84 SENDS SACRAMENTO THE RIGHT MESSAGE:**

#### **WE NEED A RELIABLE WATER SUPPLY**

This water bond does not contain ANY funds for new reservoirs, aqueducts, or water storage! The water diversions mandated by this bond will actually take away drinking water from current sources.

### **NO on 84 PROTECTS YOU FROM SPECIAL INTERESTS**

Bond funds can be awarded to the same private organizations that placed this initiative on the ballot, campaigned for it, and bought advertising to promote it. This is a perversion of the initiative process.

### **NO on 84 SAVES MONEY FOR REAL FLOOD CONTROL**

Flood control is vital, but less than 15% of bond funds are dedicated to

**SUBJECT TO COURT  
ORDERED CHANGES**

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF

PROPOSITION 84

that purpose — and that money could be chewed up for studies, environmental planning, environmental mitigation, and bureaucratic administration. If bureaucratic reports could stop flooding, we'd no longer have a problem.

PLEASE JOIN US IN VOTING NO on 84.

Bill Leonard, Member  
California State Board of Equalization

Ron Nehring, Senior Consultant  
Americans for Tax Reform

Lewis K. Uhler, President  
National Tax Limitation Committee

**SUBJECT TO COURT  
ORDERED CHANGES**